Airport Management Advisory Committee

Minutes of Meeting –January 13, 2017 at Town Hall

Arthur Malman, Chairman of Town of East Hampton's Airport Management Advisory Committee ("AMAC"), called the meeting to order at 9 AM.

The following members of the AMAC were present: voting members, Cindy Herbst, David Gruber, Gene Oshrin, Charles Ehren and Arthur Malman and non-voting ex officio members, Kathee Burke-Gonzalez, Councilwoman and Board liaison for the AMAC, James Brundige, interim Airport Director, and Len Bernard, the Town's Chief Budget Officer. Participating by telephone was Munir Saltoun. Absent were Pat Trunzo III and Bonnie Krupinski.

Among others attending (some of whom attended only part of the meeting) were Larry Cantwell, Town Supervisor, Marguerite Wolffsohn, Town Planning Director, Alex Walter, Executive Assistant to the Supervisor, and Kent Feuerring, the president of the EH Aviation Association, along with several other members of the public.

Michael Waibel and Greg VanderMolen of Baker Engineering, and Ron Price of QED, also joined the meeting by telephone.

Arthur Malman invited all members of the public to join the discussion. The agenda had been previously distributed by Kathee Burke-Gonzalez.

The next meeting was SCHEDULED for 10 AM on Friday January 27, 2017 with subsequent meetings for Friday February 17 at 9 AM and March 3, 2017 at 9 AM.

Arthur Malman said that the draft minutes of the December 2, 2016 meeting, as circulated with corrections to the initial draft, would be held open until the next meeting at the request of members who asked for a little more time for their review.

Kathee Burke-Gonzalez passed out two outlines prepared Ron Price:

(1) explaining the construction of wind rose diagrams for airport crosswind in general

(2) proposing the procedures for data collection and the analysis of crosswinds at HTO.

Ron Price led a discussion of the first outline and answered questions about the construction of wind rose diagrams.

He then led a detailed discussion of the data collection and the data sources available for HTO. Sound had been taking readings for more than 10 years prior to the certification of the HTO AWOS and he noted that, with the exception of observations from 9/15 and 10/15, observations for most days had been taken hourly during working hours, although not necessarily on the hour. Cindy Herbst said that Sound readings were transmitted regularly through a local federal office to the National Climatic Data Center (NCDC) and she would see if she could find hard data for the two missing months. While it would

better to have the data for the two missing months, Ron Price and the members agreed that, given the large number of data that were available, this omission should not be significant.

Ron Price explained that the HTO AWOS, which provided data starting in early 2016, was giving us data every 20 minutes rather than hourly as would be the case for most of the prior NCDC data. Arthur Malman asked if this triple weighting of 2016 data would skew the results, but David Gruber and Ron Price felt that the effect would be minimal. Cindy Tuma mentioned that she had found some mistaken weather data coming out of the HTO AWOS and James Brundige said he would check on this.

Ron Price noted that the FAA recommends hourly data analysis of wind for 10 years which would be a potential for 87,000 data points. However, since HTO's secondary runway would not be used except dawn to dusk when VFR conditions would prevail, we could eliminate 40,874 potential observations during such 10 year test period from dusk to dawn when VFR would not be available and 8,066 potential daytime observations when only IFR would be useable--because of adverse weather so HTO's secondary runway would not be used--for a possibility of 38,660 net ideal observations.

He then stated that of the 46,127 that were found in the NCDC data base for the 10 year test period for HTO, after deducting dusk to dawn hours, IFR only times, and 2,649 quality control data points (e.g. showing 150 mile per hour winds that never happened), we have 25, 853 net usable observations for HTO for the 10 year test period—about 67% of the FAA net ideal observations which the committee, on the recommendation of Ron Price, felt would be acceptable.

While Ron Price suggested not only testing coverage limits of 10.5 knots as the FAA suggests, but also 8 and 6 knots. James Brundige explained that each aircraft has a manual that recommends a maximum crosswind for the particular aircraft and Kent Feuerring noted that, for example, his small airplane's was 16 knots. Arthur Malman stated that, since local pilots had recommended that HTO put in a voluntary floor of 10 knots beneath which the crosswind runway should be avoided, it would not serve much purpose to study crosswinds at speeds below that which the local pilots did not believe a crosswind runway would be needed. The AMAC members and Kent Feuerring felt that only 10.5 should be tested.

After discussion of practical combinations of concurrent use of runways at HTO, the committee cut back to 6 the 11 runways combinations that QED proposed to study.

QED also proposed studying actual use of the secondary runways at HTO based on Vector data for actual landings and takeoffs on a secondary runway. Gene Oshrin pointed out that such data would be unfairly skewed because the HTO seasonal Tower routinely limits use of the secondary runway when the airport is only marginally busy--even beyond normal peak times. Kent Feuerring also noted that a pilot whose only choice had been for crosswind runway 16-34 or the main runway might have made a different choice if 4-22 (which has been closed in recent years) been available

David Gruber stated that such Vector data could be useful to our study since, if the Tower is limiting use of the secondary runway at busy times, then it would not be relevant to consider theoretical usage of a secondary runway at times when it is not available because of Tower restrictions on use. On

the other hand, Kent Feuerring pointed out that the historical data would also not be predictive since the Tower chief had only recently, after a presentation by the pilots' association, agreed to cut back the hours of secondary runway restriction.

Charles Ehren felt that the Vector data should be developed so that it was available if needed. Arthur Malman asked the estimated cost of developing this data set. Since the estimated charges by Vector alone were given at $8,000, he thought that the final cost might be around $15,000. Given the fact that the data could be produced at a later date if needed, the committee determined to eliminate such Vector data analysis at this time.

Arthur Malman asked the meeting to consider tree cutting next since Marguerite Wolffsohn was available. He indicated that meetings with local tree cutters had indicated that selective cutting would be practical in areas where only a few trees penetrated the 20:1 plane. He further stated that some arborists now recommend leaving small chips on site rather removing them and asked Marguerite Wolffsohn whether she concurred. Marguerite Wolffsohn stated that she disagreed and would want them removed.

David Gruber noted that Zachary Cohen had done significant work on the tree cutting issue and he could give a full presentation at the next meeting. Arthur Malman indicated that should not be a problem since it is not likely that tree cutting could be done before mid-March after which date Marguerite Wolffsohn recommended not proceeding because of local bird nesting issues.

Kathee Burke-Gonzalez stressed that the meeting should move now on tree cutting so cutting could be started more promptly. Arthur Malman indicated before tree cutters could bid, Baker would first have to redo their zone cutting diagrams which the surveyors would need to stake out on the ground the various zones for actual cutting. Michael Waibel confirmed that Baker's original tree cutting zone diagram presented a few months ago had been produced on the basis of a 34:1 approach plane rather than the 20:1 now to be used and would need to be redone. Some participants felt that, once Baker produced the new 20:1 zone cutting diagrams, bidding could proceed concurrently with the surveyor's work on staking them out.

Arthur Malman asked if rather than bidding, the procedure might be for RFP's? Kathee Burke-Gonzalez disagreed and wanted to use bidding to keep on schedule. Len Bernard explained the differences between RFP's and bids and it seemed that RFP responses in certain cases could result in a final award. The committee deferred to the Town Board on the appropriate procedure.

To keep things moving forward given the mid-March deadline, the members felt that, rather than delaying until the next AMAC meeting, Jim Brundige and Kathee Burke-Gonzalez should confer with David Gruber and Zachary Cohen during the coming week and the AMAC would be content to have this group recommend to the Town the precise procedures to follow on the tree cutting process in the now agreed upon zones. If it were not possible to proceed with actual cutting this spring, the Town could still meet with the FAA in the next couple of months and explain the final procedures and limitations for the proposed tree cutting in fall/winter 2017, given the countervailing environmental restrictions in the water recharge district in which the airport is situated.

Arthur Malman pointed out that there appears to be an error in the Baker fence maximum height computations at the ends of the secondary runways—Baker shows a maximum fence height here of 12 feet although a lower fence height at the end of the main runway--although the main runway end is substantially closer to Daniels Hole Road. Apparently this was because the fence height for the main runway was based on a climb starting 200 feet after the end of the runway but the fence height for the secondary runway was based on a climb starting immediately after the runway end—there appears to be no FAA requirement for this difference in calculation methodology.

David Gruber stated that Cornell's authority on deer fence heights had indicated that low double fences were ineffective and that a minimum 8 foot fence around the airport should be used. Kent Feuerring presented a proposal from the pilots association to continue the 8 foot fence at the runway ends which would include a frangible portion and lights.

Arthur Malman confirmed with Michael Waibel, Baker's prior advice that, while a frangible pole or lights could be used at the end of a runway, a frangible fence would not be acceptable since a plane's landing gear could get tangled in the fence, without even considering whether the deer could learn to push over a frangible section of the deer fence.

After discussion it was determined that an 8 foot fence would be used along the entire operational perimeter, with lights at the runway ends. [Gene Oshrin had left the meeting at this point but subsequently pointed out: *"In discussing the confusion over the stated position of the East Hampton Aviation Association as regards the height of the deer fence with Kent,we both agreed that regardless of comments to the effect that EHAA came to any agreement within the " fence sub-committee ", no such consensus was subsequently reached within that committee. I therefore repeat that the position of EHAA is that any fence height over four feet within the clear zones is unacceptable to EHAA and airport users as an unsafe obstruction to air traffic. The re-location of Daniel's Hole Rd. recommended by the 2010 Airport Master Plan has always been opposed by airport opponents as " airport expansion "in spite of its obvious advantages in relieving conflicts between ground traffic and air operations*"].

This plan should be discussed with the FAA which would be given the choice of the lighted 8 foot fence at the runway ends or a lower, possibly ineffective, double deer fence—although the FAA could also recommend that the runways be shortened to accommodate the 8 foot deer fence.

James Brundige reported that he had met with a local fence contractor on the state's approved list who had proposed a low safety fence around the patio area and on the open south end of the terminal. He explained that the low fence could continue under the roofed open south end of the terminal since deer would not jump a fence under a low roof. The higher 8 foot deer fence would continue to the south where the roof ended and down the sides of the parking lot.

There would be controlled access gates (1) in the safety section near the patio, (2) in the deer fence south of the terminal roof and (3) from the auto parking area into the aircraft parking lot and at the other perimeter deer fence sections previously discussed.

James Brundige explained that the lower safety fence would be decorative and the deer fence would be basic chain link. Several members pointed out that the deer fence was not to be chain link but

rather the more standard open mesh used throughout the town. James Brundige explained that the contractor had indicated that the chain link was cheaper but he would come back with an alternative price for the open mesh and would also include warning lights and sounds (along with notice to the office) if a gate were left open.

Arthur Malman suggested that the standard 8 foot deer fence and automated gates be installed now in all but the runway ends which may require more consultation with the FAA. Kathee Burke-Gonzalez noted that there might need to be an adjustment in the Baker work authorization which now included work on the non-aeronautical portions of the deer fence after the Town found that the small savings resulting from using LKMA for the non-aeronautical portion would not justify using two different firms on the deer fence project.

James Brundige reported that Bruce Miller had agreed to return as chief controller for the Tower this summer.

Arthur Malman indicated that, now that the new bypass had been dropped from the work authorization for the taxiway A connector, there had been no further comments from the AMAC on the proposed work authorization for the completion of the taxiway.

James Brundige reported that work would be proceeding on the PAPIs/RELIs and that several bidders had responded on the fuel farm. There would be an additional two weeks given to fuel farm bidders to reflect some minor clarifications. Len Bernard said that he would arrange a bond authorization for the fuel farm work for up to $1.5 million but if the final cost is lower there would be no problem issuing longer term bonds for a lesser amount.

James Brundige also reported that positions for the security cameras had been finalized and that the project should be starting shortly.

The meeting adjourned at noon

Respectfully submitted,

Arthur Malman